

## REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending in the application. Claims 23-27 are newly added to the application in this Reply. No new matter has been added to the application by way of these claim amendments.

The examiner's specification and claims amendments are overcome or they are traversed as set forth below.

### I. TRAVERSE OF THE ANTICIPATION REJECTION

The examiner rejected claims 1, 5-6, 8-12, 15-20 and 22 for being anticipated by Choon et al. (USP 5,608,188). Moreover, the examiner rejected claims 1-2 and 15-20 for being anticipated by Benzoni (USP 5,416,688). The pending application claims are believed to be novel over each of the recited references for the reasons given below.

It is the examiner's position Choon et al. discloses that surface 103 is adapted to be at least partially absorbent to electromagnetic radiation. The examiner's understanding of Choon et al. is incorrect. All that Choon et al. discloses is that surface 103 "electromagnetically divides" the enclosure into multiple compartments (see Abstract). Similarly, the Choon et al. specification discloses that "partition 103 has electromagnetic shielding properties". (Choon et al. Col. 2, lines 48-49). Thus, what Choon et al. discloses is an electromagnetic shield. The shielding is accomplished according to Choon et al., by using a metallic or metal coated partition. (See column 2, line 51 of Choon et al.). Thus, the materials used to construct the multi-compartment shield of Choon et al. are intended to reflect (shield) and not absorb electromagnetic radiation. For at least this reason, claims 1, 5-6, 8-12, 15-20 and 22, which all include the partially absorbent feature missing from Choon et al, are novel and patentable.

Claims 1-12 and 20 are also novel over Benzoni for the same reasons the claims are novel over Choon et al. Specifically, Benzoni discloses a housing that includes shielding walls. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Benzoni that the walls include a conductive material that is adapted to be at least partially absorbent to electromagnetic radiation.

A second and independent basis for the novelty of claims 1-12 and 15-20 over Benzoni is because Benzoni does not disclose a material having at least one surface extending into the cavity. It is the examiner's position that the Benzoni dividing wall 52 discloses this feature.

However, the claimed dividing wall extends into the cavity while the Benzoni dividing wall is already located in the cavity. Moreover, the purposes of dividing walls are different. The Benzoni wall behaves as a wall – it is used to divide one area of the housing from another. An important purpose of the claimed conductive and partially absorbing wall is to reduce the effective size of the cavity in which the wall is placed. For each of the reasons recited above, claims 1-12 and 15-20 are novel and the examiner's rejection of the claims over Benzoni should be withdrawn.

## **II. TRAVERSE OF THE OBVIOUSNESS REJECTION**

The examiner objects claims 14-15 as being unpatentable for obviousness over Choon et al. in view of Miska (USP 6,901,660). Moreover, the examiner rejected claim 21 as being unpatentable for obviousness over Choon et al. alone.

Claims 14-15 and claim 20 are nonobvious and patentable over the prior art recited by the examiner for the same reasons set forth in traversing the anticipation rejection of Choon et al. above. Namely, neither of the cited references discloses nor suggests a package having a conductive material surface that is adapted to be at least partially absorbent to electromagnetic radiation. For at least this reason, the examiner's obviousness rejection should be withdrawn.

## **III. NEW CLAIMS 23-27**

New claims 23-27 have been added to the application. Claims 23-27 depend directly or indirectly upon claim 1 and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons recited in Section II above. Claims 23-27 are also patentable because they add features to the claimed invention not disclosed or suggested in the prior art.

### CONCLUSION

Based upon the amendments and statements in favor of patentability presented above, the applicants submit that all pending application claims are now allowable. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of all pending application claims is, therefore, courteously solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: June 22, 2007

By: /A. Blair Hughes/  
A. Blair Hughes  
Reg. No. 32,901  
312-913-2123  
hughes@mbhb.com